



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

He has now presented to us a full life-portrait of the first great English colony in America. And nothing is clearer than that this colony was but a part of England—a projection of Shakespeare's country across the wide Atlantic. In church, as in state, affairs Virginia was a new England. The country, its life, its organization, its whole spirit was genuinely English. There were the aristocratic leading families, the sturdy yeomen, the servant class; and the county lieutenant, the dignified justice of the peace, the quiet, ceremonious clergyman, the self-perpetuating vestry were all good counterparts of similar local officials or institutions in England.

The old story that Virginia manifested no interest in education, that the church languished for the lack of devoted clergymen, receives a severe blow from these pages; and the opinion that all Puritans and saints settled in Massachusetts and that only cavaliers or worse people went to Virginia is also shown to be entirely incorrect. The so-called Old Dominion was a resort, even in the seventeenth century, for Puritans and Quakers; and Massachusetts was perhaps the home of as many cavaliers as was the more southern offshoot of England.

The treatment of all these topics by the author is without bias of any kind; there are no invidious comparisons, there is no defense of anything—simply the straightforward narration of the facts, unadorned, to be sure, except that every page shows forth truthful history, and that is adornment indeed. Every scholar must be grateful for this thorough, complete, and final work upon the subject and in the years to come its influence will very likely be greater even than that of the *Economic History* which has been for a decade the most quoted book on Virginia.

WILLIAM E. DODD

Organismic Theories of the State. By F. W. COKER. New York: Columbia University (Longmans, Green & Co., Agents), 1910. Pp. 209. \$1.50.

After a rather lengthy introduction in which conceptions partly organismic, the combinations of contractual and organismic ideas, and the metaphysical conceptions of the organism as held by Hegel, Schelling, Krause, Ahrens, Waitz, and others are reviewed, the author takes up the body of his analysis as follows: (1) The

Psychic Conception of the State, (2) The "Natural Science" of the State, and (3) The State and the Social Organism. Under (1) he considers the theories of Görres, Welcker, Rohmer, Volgraff, Stahl, Schmittenner, Stein, Lasson, and Gierke; under (2) the theories of Zacharia, Volgraff, Frantz, and Bluntschli; and under (3) those of Comte, Spencer, Lilienfeld, Schäffle, Worms, and Fouillée. Though Dr. Coker is ostensibly dealing with the organismic theories of the state, the internal evidence of his subject-matter shows that the writers he treats were, for the most part, concerned primarily with organismic theories of society as a whole. Consequently, Dr. Coker has been more or less under the necessity of selecting his facts, a procedure which is always open to the danger of throwing them out of focus with the viewpoint of the writers themselves. This species of displacement has, however, been fairly well guarded against.

Dr. Coker's conclusions are essentially as follows:

The theorists failed to make explicit and definite their rendering of terms; certain fundamental propositions involved in their conception of organism or person cannot be validly asserted of the state; such of their propositions as are valid are inadequate to prove that the state is an organism or person in the sense either in which these terms are commonly used, or in which the theorists must be inferred to have conceived them; and the hypothesis that the state is an organism or person has no practical or moral consequence (p. 202). . . . The important part of the work of the writers we have studied has been their insistent statement of what we may call the secondary principles of their systems (p. 203).

These secondary principles he summarizes as the close interdependence among the citizens and institutions of the state; the political effects of environment in its broadest sense; the consequences of antecedent state events; the perpetual and important character of the aim of political organization in its relation to the career of man; and the relatively subordinate importance of any particular department of that organization (pp. 202-3).

With most of Dr. Coker's criticisms we may agree and yet insist that, at least from the standpoint of the sociologist, he has missed the point. We may dismiss the biological analogies without further comment. But the fact that the actual truths of the organismic theories lie in what Dr. Coker terms "the secondary principles" has for us an important meaning. The primary motives or purposes of a theory or movement frequently do not appear in its argumenta-

tive or propaganda literature; in the effort to make the concepts explicit and concrete the argument frequently becomes lost in subsidiary details, which for many are the sole animus of discussion. This notably has been the case in connection with the organismic theories.

The significant fact about the organismic movement in social and political theory is that it was in practically all the stages of its growth a more or less conscious protest against the old individualistic theories. It conceived of society and the state as the most highly organized institution in society, as something more than the product of the individual consciousness, tracing their origin at various times to divine fiat, to a growth from inner necessity, and finally to the collective reaction upon environment. The absurd analogies were primarily in the nature of illustrations. The prevailing motive of the movement has been to establish the necessary unity of society as the condition of securing a higher degree of co-operation among its members. Novicov—whom the author does not cite—expressly states this as its purpose,¹ and Durkheim—to whom the author also does not refer—lays great stress upon the theory that society is the organismic or unitary product of a co-operative differentiation of functions.² Even Spencer—almost the only pronounced individualist among the theorists of the social organism—has been shown by Huxley to have contradicted himself in drawing his individualistic conclusions.³

It is a mistake to find the chief significance of the organismic theories in their analogies. The facts of importance in this connection are those which called the various organismic theories into existence.

L. L. BERNARD

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Mental Discipline and Educational Values. By W. H. HECK, M.A., Professor of Education in the University of Virginia. New York: John Lane Co., 1909. Pp. 147.

It is illuminating to notice the convergence of opinion in educational thought toward the idea that the external objective conditions to be found in the environment of the individual as he

¹ *Conscience et volonté sociales*, 2-3, 9-10; *Annales de l'Institut international de sociologie*, (1898), 188.

² *De la division du travail social*.

³ T. H. Huxley, "Administrative Nihilism," *Essays* (Appleton), 1, 269 ff.